



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/614,468 07/07/2003 Michael Yeh 251807-1010 7633 24504 7590 01/28/2005 **EXAMINER** THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP BASTIANELLI, JOHN 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER STE 1750 ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948 3751

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/614,468	YEH, MICHAEL
		Examiner	Art Unit
	John Bastianelli	3751	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov r sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
Status ·			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27	December 2004.	
2a)□	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.	
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□			
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>			
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/27/04. 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:			

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Species I of Figs. 1A-1B pertaining to claims 1-5 in the reply filed on December 27, 2004 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). The examiner would like to thank the applicant for calling to clarify the restriction requirement as the examiner mistakenly used the claim #'s instead of the figure #'s in the restriction requirement of November 29, 2004.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Trost et al. EP 0102528 A2.

Trost discloses a pressure regulating device for a container 11 in which gas is contained, the container having a vent hole 13 through which the gas is vented, the pressure-regulating device having an electrical control unit 22 for outputting a voltage; a deformable member 21 coupled to the electrical control unit, wherein the voltage causes the deformable member to generate a corresponding deformation; and an adjustment member 21b disposed on the deformable member and opposite to the vent hole, wherein the deformation causes the adjustment member to

Art Unit: 3751

generate a corresponding displacement, and causes the vent hole to open or close according to the displacement of the adjustment member so that the interior pressure of the container may be regulated. The deformable member is seen as a piezoelectric sheet.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claim 3, and alternatively 2, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trost et al. EP 0102528 A2 in view of Lazarus et al. US 6,024,340.

Trost lacks a laminated piezoelectric sheet. Lazarus discloses a laminated piezoelectric sheet (col. 5, lines 13-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the piezoelectric deformable member of Trost into a laminated piezoelectric sheet as disclosed by Lazarus in order to provide "a unitized and unitary stiff but flexible laminated sheet assembly".

6. Claim 4, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trost et al. EP 0102528 A2 in view of Weber et al. US 5,880,752.

Trost lacks a bi-metallic deformable member. Weber discloses using a bi-metallic member (col. 5, lines 19-25) as the deformable member. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the piezoelectric deformable member

Page 4

Art Unit: 3751

of Trost into a bimetallic sheet as disclosed by Weber in order to provide a cheaper apparatus in which to make the valve (bimetallic strips are common in thermostats).

7. Claim 5, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trost et al. EP 0102528 A2 in view of Biegelsen et al. US 6,123,316.

Trost lacks a memorizing alloy deformable member. Biegelsen discloses the equivalency of piezoelectric and shape memory alloy (SMA) deformable members (col. 8, lines 9-29). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the piezoelectric deformable member of Trost into a memorizing alloy deformable member as disclosed by Biegelsen as memorizing alloys provide a quicker response time.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Miyazoe discloses laminated piezoelectric. Talbot discloses the equivalency of using piezoelectric and bimetallic members. Ito discloses a shape memorizing alloy. Frick, Jacobsson, Bouchard, Castle, and Lloyd disclose piezoelectric pressure regulating valves. Russell, Sulatisky, Nusz, and Surjaatmadja disclose pressure regulating valves controlled by an electronic unit.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Bastianelli whose telephone number is (571) 272-4921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-6:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John Bastianelli Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3751

/ IR

January 26, 2005